

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet(s)" of drawings include(s) changes to Figure(s) 21-25. The attached "Replacement Sheet(s)," which include(s) Figure(s) 21-25, replace(s) the original sheet(s) including Figure(s) 21-25.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

### **REMARKS**

Claims 21-24 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-20 have been withdrawn. Claims 23-24 have been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **DRAWINGS**

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant(s) have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet(s)" the drawings have been amended by adding the legend "Prior Art" to Figures 21-25.

### **INTERVIEW WITH THE EXAMINER**

Applicants thank the Examiner and his supervisor for the courtesies extended during an interview conducted over the telephone on June 28, 2005. While no formal agreements were reached, new claim language, which is presented in Claims 23 and 24, was discussed and was believed to be patentable over the references already of record.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended and therefore render the objection moot.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Azuma et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,441,888). Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanade et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,427,880). Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Grindon (U.S. Pat. No. 4,871,256). Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holec (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,744). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

### **Rejection of Claim 21 under 35 USC §102**

The feature of the invention recited in claim 21 resides in that the plurality of light sources are arranged on a flat surface with optical axes thereof disposed radially toward an object.

Kaneda et al. (USP 4,427,880; "Kaneda") discloses that the discrete light sources 22 project a light beam onto the object 30 (see Fig. 6). The optical axes may be regarded as being disposed radially toward the object 30. However, in Kaneda, the optical axes are tilted so as to focus the light beam onto the object, which is different from the present invention.

Grindon (USP 4,871,256) discloses the two spaced lens assemblies 12, 14 (see Fig. 1), but the optical axes thereof are oriented parallel to each other (see col. 3, lines 52-58).

Holec (USP 6,392,744) discloses the three lasers 100 which are inclined toward the center of the target 120 to generate a narrow light beam emitted along the optical

path 102 (see Figs. 1-3). In the configuration, the optical axes are inclined so as to focus the light beam onto the object, which is different from the present invention.

Rejection of Claim 22 under 35USC§102

The feature of the invention recited in claim 22 resides in that groups of light sources respectively covering the plurality of divided ranges are aligned in a direction perpendicular to the direction for forming the light pattern. None of the cited references discloses or suggests such configuration. Holec discloses a modification of the shape of the target (see Figs. 7 and 8), but it is not related to the present invention at all.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 5, 2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
GAS/kk

By: Greg Stobbs  
Gregory A. Stobbs  
Reg. No. 28,764